Donald Haase

Challenges of Folktale and Fairy-Tale Studies in the Twenty-First Century

Abstract: Fascicle by fascicle, volume by volume, over the course of the last forty years, the *Enzyklopädie des Märchens* (*EM*) has significantly changed the landscape of folktale and fairy-tale studies. Accompanying the publication of the *EM*, parallel developments reflected and complemented its influential agenda to promote historical and comparative folk-narrative research. The history of these developments not only illuminates the vitality and interdisciplinary importance that contemporary folktale and fairy-tale studies have achieved; it also helps to identify and explain the challenges we face as we contemplate current research and imagine the field's future. This paper reviews critical developments of the last forty years and then considers how we might come to grips with the ensuing challenge of sustaining, in a responsible way, the comparative study of folktales and fairy tales in a global context.

Résumé: Durant quarante ans, fascicule après fascicule, tome après tome, l'Enzyklopädie des Märchens a marqué le champ des recherches sur le conte populaire et le conte de fées. Elle a entraîné des progrès décisifs des recherches historiques et comparées sur le conte, ses travaux s'accompagnant d'évolutions parallèles venant les compléter et les interroger. Cet article présente l'histoire de ces évolutions, et donc le dynamisme et l'importance interdisciplinaire de la recherche contemporaine sur le récit populaire et le conte, tout en contribuant à une délimitation et à une explicitation des défis que nous rencontrons en observant la recherche actuelle et en envisageant son avenir. Après un panorama des évolutions critiques des quarante dernières années, l'article examine les modalités permettant de poursuivre de manière responsable les recherches sur le récit et le conte populaire dans un contexte global.

Zusammenfassung: Über vierzig Jahre lang, Heft für Heft, Band für Band, hat die *Enzyklopädie des Märchens* das Gebiet der Volkserzähl- und Märchenforschung verändert. Sie hat die historische und vergleichende Erzählforschung entscheidend vorangebracht, wobei ihre Mission von Parallelentwicklungen begleitet, ergänzt und reflektiert wurde. Dieser Aufsatz beleuchtet einerseits die Geschichte

Prof. Dr. Donald Haase, Professor of German, College of Liberal Arts & Sciences, Wayne State University, Detroit (MI), E-mail: aa3969@wayne.edu

dieser Entwicklungen und damit die Lebendigkeit und interdisziplinäre Bedeutung der zeitgenössischen Erzähl- und Märchenforschung. Andererseits soll dazu beigetragen werden, jene Herausforderungen zu markieren und zu erläutern, denen wir begegnen, wenn wir die aktuelle Forschung betrachten und zukünftige Aufgaben bedenken. Der Beitrag gibt zunächst einen Überblick über kritische Entwicklungen der vergangenen vierzig Jahre. Es folgen Überlegungen, wie wir die vergleichende Erzähl- und Märchenforschung im globalen Kontext in verantwortlicher Weise fortführen können.

Fascicle by fascicle, volume by volume, over the course of the last forty years, the *Enzyklopädie des Märchens* (*EM*) has changed the landscape of folktale and fairy-tale studies. Among its many contributions was its use of widely diverse collaborators to map a field that knows no national, cultural, or ethnic boundaries. The effort to bring scholars of folk-narrative studies together into an international interdisciplinary community came with the field's institutionalization, which included the founding of *Fabula* in 1957, the first international congress of folk-narrative scholars in 1959, and the formal creation of the International Society for Folk Narrative Research (*ISFNR*) in 1962. As we know from the preface to the first volume of the *EM* in 1977, this institutionalization was a pragmatic strategy to mobilize future contributors for that Herculean project, based on a historical and comparative approach to folk narrative (Ranke et al. 1977, vi). In the same year as the founding of the *ISFNR*, Max Lüthi – who straddled folk narrative and literary studies – published his now-classic research guide, and in it he asserted that "the systematic study of the fairy tale" originated in the work of the Brothers Grimm, in that "their prefaces, annotations, and letters had already raised the decisive questions about the nature, meaning, manner of existence, and origin of folktales and thus laid the foundation for a comprehensive theory of the fairy tale" (Lüthi 1962, 63)[1]. The timing of Lüthi's assertion may suggest that 'a comprehensive theory' was in place when the *ISFNR* was established and the *EM* was conceived, but the diverse scholarship that Lüthi surveyed in his research guide suggests otherwise. So do the diverse methodologies represented by the members of the first editorial board, the wide scope of topics ultimately published in the *EM*, and the diverse disciplinary affiliations and backgrounds of its many contributors.

Moreover, the *EM* emerged in an era of transformation when folklore studies in both Germany and North America continued to debate their identities and internal

---

[1] Translations into English are mine. Quotations in the original German are given in the notes. Here: „die systematische Erforschung des Märchens"; and „Ihre Vorreden, Anmerkungen und Briefe stellten schon die entscheidenden Fragen nach Wesensart, Bedeutung, Lebensweise und Ursprung der Volksmärchen und legten so die Grundlage zu einer umfassenden Märchentheorie."

divisions, anticipating the questions about "grand theory" that have continued to occupy folklorists and exemplifying "the ongoing, highly reflexive character of the discipline" (Schmidt-Lauber 2012, 560)[2]. This was a time of conceptual re-orientation that brought new theoretical perspectives and methodological approaches – including performance, reception, and response studies. Simultaneously, due to the increasing influence and spread of cultural studies, the boundaries between so-called high culture and low culture began to dissolve, challenging disciplinary boundaries and bringing scholars of comparative and national literatures into increasing contact and sometimes conflict with folklorists, ethnologists, and anthropologists. At that very moment folk-narrative scholars under the leadership of Kurt Ranke were mobilizing to stabilize, formalize, centralize, and promote a coherent international community, folk-narrative scholarship was on the verge of big changes. The dialectic is not only relentless; it can also be impatient.

Indeed, a lot has changed in the study of folktales and fairy-tales since the project's initial conception in the 1950s and 1960s and since the publication of the *EM*'s first fascicle in 1975. It seems to me that from the very start the challenge for the *EM* has been not only to provide a comprehensive resource for an extremely wide field of study, but also to maintain its coherence and primary mission over decades of significant disciplinary change. I think, for example, of the influential rise of sociopolitical fairy-tale scholarship, which began nearly simultaneously with the *EM* and has continued to expand into the twenty-first century, at first in Germany and then, especially, in North America via American Germanists (Haase 2003). While the comparative-historical research being promoted by the *EM* relied in some fundamental ways on the typological foundations and tools of the historical-geographical method, sociohistorical and sociocultural scholarship influenced by Marxism and the Frankfurt School began to critique folktales and fairy-tales with little regard for the "scientific" apparatus of motifs and tale types. While the *EM*, as Jack Zipes suggests in his paper (2016), quietly sought to distance itself from folklore's politicization and problematic past by being democratically inclusive, scholarship inspired by critical theory, Marxism, and other approaches attentive to social and historical contexts placed politics front and center, and scrutinized folklore and fairy-tales in the context of their abuse by National Socialism and their role in sociohistorical, cultural, and political struggles[3]. Folktales and fairy-tales held enormous interest as reflections of social, cultural, and political dynamics, especially for politically engaged scholars in Germany and North America. So texts and genres that had been largely within the domain of folklore and folk-narrative research now interested scholars from numerous disciplines, who staked out their

---

2 See, for example, Bausinger et al. 1978; Dorson 1972; Dow 2008; and Paredes/Baumann 1972.
3 See, for example, Bausinger 1965; Kamenetsky 1972, 1977; Zipes 1983.

own claims for including them in comparative and national literary studies, children's literature studies, pedagogy, social history, and women's studies.

Literary scholarship has played an especially important role in folk-narrative and fairy-tale studies since the 1970s and 1980s. Writing in 1986 in the wake of the Grimm bicentennial years, Australian Germanist Hans Kuhn, explained how literary scholars had paid little attention to the *Kinder- und Hausmärchen* because they perceived the Grimms' collection to be a work of collective folklore and not legitimate literary art. That changed dramatically in the 1970 s when increasing awareness of Grimms' editorial interventions and a new understanding of the collection's textual history demonstrated that Grimms' stories were "individually created verbal [or literary] works of art" (Kuhn 1986, 234)[4]. This put them directly into the realm of literary history and analysis and prompted Kuhn to declare: "Literary scholarship would have every reason to reclaim, with renewed energy, the *Kinder- und Hausmärchen* as its property" (ibid., 235).[5]

I cite Kuhn's appeal to German literary scholarship not because his article was influential but because it expresses so clearly the generic appropriation and disciplinary remapping that had already been taking place among literary scholars and literary folklorists in Europe and North America (Haase 2003). The claim to Grimms' tales among Germanists – a claim that was ultimately transferred to literary scholars more generally – had a parallel in the recovery of fairy-tales as an object of research by specialists in other national literatures. A good example is the publication in 1975 of Jacques Barchilon's *Le conte merveilleux français*, which directed attention to the neglected *contes de fées* of the late seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, paving the way for new literary research on French fairy-tales that has had an impact well beyond French studies (see, for example, Seifert 1996, Canepa 1997, and Harries 2001).

But even the literary claim to folktales and fairy-tales has its limitations and had to give way to new, challenging developments. As the boundaries of traditional disciplines have shifted or dissolved, folktales and fairy-tales have been embraced by or pulled into new fields, such as gender and queer studies, film studies, media studies, and evolutionary psychology[6]. And these have generated new theories, methods, objectives, critical tools, resources, and ideological, political, and social critiques, thereby further expanding the scope of folktale and fairy-tale studies.

---

4 „Individuell gestaltete sprachliche Kunstwerke".

5 „Die Literaturwissenschaft aber hätte allen Grund, die KHM energischer als ihr Eigentum zu reklamieren."

6 See, for example, the introduction and the entries on Gender, Queer and Transgender Theory, Animation, Film and Video, Silent Films and Fairy Tales, Music Videos, Media and Popular Culture, and Meme in: Duggan/Haase 2016.

I have provided this brief summary of selected developments to suggest that the four decades in the course of which the *EM* was at the center of folk-narrative research and taking shape as the field's most comprehensive and inclusive resource were a time during which folktale and fairy-tale studies were becoming increasingly decentralized, expansive, and difficult to encompass. While the *EM*, in its current form at least, has reached its prescribed limit, the expansive dynamic of the field has not. In that context, I offer some concise reflections on challenges faced by folktale and fairy-tale studies at the beginning of the twenty-first century. Given the international scope of scholarship and the diverse interests I have just described, it would be presumptuous to imply that 'we' share a universally acknowledged agenda or necessarily common challenges. So while the challenges described here reflect the perspective of a North American scholar of fairy-tale studies, they are grounded in the belief that they have wider implications and that successfully meeting them requires us – us, without qualification or scare quotes – to undertake transdisciplinary and transcultural interventions and interactions.

The Expanding Universe of Stories

The explosion of new media and technologies has created extraordinary challenges for many fields of cultural study, and folktale and fairy-tale studies are no exception. Once upon a time, in the 1970s, 1980s, and 1990s, challenges faced in particular by Anglo-European scholars were significant but manageable: (1) decenter the study of folktales and fairy-tales by questioning and dismantling the Western canon, which valued primarily texts produced and appropriated by Anglo-European males; (2) expand the corpus of texts by recovering suppressed or neglected tales by women and other marginalized or colonized groups; and (3) extend the field study beyond oral and literary texts by documenting and investigating the adaptation, production, and reception of tales in other genres and media, such as film, advertising, art, and so on. We might have been more careful, however, of what we wished for. Today, new media and technology have turned the proverbial ocean of stories, which is large but navigable, into an un-manageable and un-imaginable universe of stories – an expansive universe with no discernable center, no borders, no limits. The Internet presents us with an ever expanding, indiscriminate, and unstable corpus of fairy-tales and related motifs in verbal narratives, videos, music, games, advertisements, art, photography, merchandise, memes, social media postings, and so on – endlessly. This hyper-proliferation of texts certainly gives us a wealth of materials, but their novelty and omnipresence threaten to complicate our selection and assessment in very practical ways.

In considering the challenges that the digital revolution has created for folkloristics more generally, Timothy R. Tangherlini has identified

> four main challenges to folkloristics as a modern discipline which grow more pressing as we move further and further into an 'algorithmic' age, challenges that underpin the development of a computational folkloristics. Broadly conceived, these four challenges are (1) collection and archiving; (2) indexing and classification; (3) visualization and navigation; and (4) analysis (2013, 8).

Tangherlini rightly point out that „these challenges have been around since the inception of the discipline" (8); however, he adds that they have become

> more acute in an age of 'Big Data' as we confront a proliferation not only of 'born digital' resources for the study of folklore but also recognize the possibilities that arise from liberating older resources from the static realm of handwritten archives, printed collections, and other 'off-line' repositories (8)[7].

In the context of folktale and fairy-tale studies, it is crucial that we work through the complex implications of the hyperproliferation and hyperdiversity of "born digital" and previously analog resources for the methods and discourse we use to select, collect, evaluate, and organize texts accessible via the Internet and other digital media. Are the conventional tools and generic terminology we have developed to describe and categorize oral, literary, musical, and visual texts adequate for the diverse fairy-tale texts, forms, motifs, and memes we encounter today? Are we able to adequately establish provenance and context of artefacts disseminated digitally – emailed, forwarded, posted, reposted, shared, tweeted, retweeted – via the Internet? Does this surfeit of texts speak for or against canon-building in a digital universe?

The digitization of the folktale and fairy-tale corpus also challenges us to develop new modes of analysis. Considering Tangherlini's vision of "the possibilities that arise from liberating older resources from the static realm of [...] printed collections" (2013, 8), one could envision how a digital historical-critical edition of Grimms' *Kinder- und Hausmärchen*, constructed hypertextually to facilitate comparison among the seventeen large and small editions published in the Grimms' lifetime, could produce new insights into the collection's development and conceivably generate innovative modes of analysis[8].

Similarly, a digitized corpus of tales challenges us to make use of computational analysis, a quantitative methodology for gaining insight into a large corpus or selection of texts that are otherwise difficult to analyze on such a large scale. Computational analysis poses a challenge in its own right in that it requires of the

---

7 On the creation of digital folktale databases, see Meder 2010.
8 Creating a historical-critical print edition of the KHM has long been a difficult proposition. See Bluhm 1995, 59–76.

scholar not only to possess expertise in folktale and fairy-tale studies but also personal expertise or access to another's expertise in using quantitative methods. It is not surprising that there have been so far uneven results among folklorists and literary scholars applying computational and statistical analysis to large samples. As I have argued elsewhere (Haase 2010), the quantitative analysis of folktales by literary scholar Jonathan Gottschall et al. (2008) falls short because of its flawed methodology and inadequate understanding of fairy-tale textuality. In contrast, folklorist Jeana Jorgensen and digital humanities specialist Scott Weingart have made a compelling case for the use of digital humanities methods and the need for cross-disciplinary collaboration in fairy-tale analysis (Jorgensen/Weingart 2013); and Jorgensen (2012, 2014) has effectively used computational analysis in her research on the body in classical European tales[9]. At the same time, folklore and literary scholars in the main have paid little long-term attention or responded unsympathetically to the research of computer scientists and anthropologists working in digital humanities who have studied the origins and dissemination of folktales using sophisticated computational and statistical methods (Graça da Silva/Tehrani 2016; Tehrani et al. 2015)[10].

Whether we use quantitative or qualitative methods, the digital presence and transmission of texts and the state of hyperconnectivity require of us to understand that the production and reception of fairy-tales occur in transcultural and global contexts that are more dynamic and complex than our conventional linear models of transmission. It is important, then, that we come to grips with the ensuing challenge of conducting and sustaining the study of fairy-tales in transcultural or global contexts, where the text inevitably exists in manifold relationships to other texts. For guidance in approaching complex issues like these, we do well to consult Cristina Bacchilega's important study, *Fairy Tales Transformed? Twenty-First*

---

9 In an intriguing development, an interdisciplinary team of faculty and student researchers from Brigham Young University (USA) and the University of Winnipeg (Canada) have collaborated to create an innovative website that uses digital bibliographic data to generate algorithmic visual representations that promise new modes of analyzing and understanding fairy tales on American television (Rudy et al. n.d.).

10 News articles on the Internet announcing the research results of Tehrani et al. (2016) in January 2016 immediately brought forth a variety of responses from folklorists on social media. A BBC news report (Fairy Tale Origins 2016) prompted some skeptical and critical responses on the Facebook page of the American Folklore Society's Folk Narrative Section that resulted in a productive interchange with Tehrani, who, in the spirit of much-needed cross-disciplinary collaboration, notes that he has „been very keen to engage with folklorists about [his] work" (see the posts from January 20–22, 2016, concerning the BBC article and the research itself at https://www.facebook.com/groups/afs.folk.narrative/). For more on developments in computational folkloristics, see the special issue of the Journal of American Folklore (Tangherlini 2016), which came to my attention after the completion of this article in 2016.

Century Adaptations and the Politics of Wonder (2013). As Bacchilega shows, the fairy-tale must be understood as a hypertext operating within a „fairy-tale web" (16–30). Multivalent and multivocal, embodying competing authorities, the fairy-tale is produced and received within a globalized culture and economy that politicize wonder, either to liberate or to oppress. Among the crucial questions Bacchilega asks is this one: "what are our responsibilities as fairy-tale scholars and cultural critics in this globalized electronic culture that continues to thrive on social inequality?" (29–30). More than ever, fairy-tale production and reception in the twenty-first century involve the economics and politics of wonder, challenging fairy-tale scholars to engage the genre in explicitly political terms in the struggle against social and economic inequality.

Translation

The fairy-tale web described by Bacchilega is both enriched and complicated by translations, which add to the fairy-tale's multivocality and act as competing authorities. Our broad field of study inevitably depends on translations, and a great deal of energy over the last forty years has been invested in translating folktales and literary fairy-tales. In his volume of translations of folktales from the Indian Ocean, Lee Haring points out that "[t]he broadening of the literary canon requires a massive program of retrieval, to which this book contributes" (2007, xii). Bit by bit, the historical, cultural, and generic landscape of fairy-tale studies has become more visible despite the cultural and linguistic myopia to which each of us, in varying degrees, is subject. The linguistic limits of fairy-tale scholars are, admittedly, more evident and thus more challenging among Anglo-American scholars. Contemporary fairy-tale studies in North America were able to take root in large measure thanks to numerous translations that have broadened awareness of the fairy-tale's scope and diversity, that have given scholars comparative contexts outside their own areas of national or cultural expertise, and have thus created awareness of intertextual relationships and revealed the vast nature of the fairy-tale web.

   Of course, dependence on translations has been a double-edged sword for fairy-tale studies. While translation has allowed for a more comprehensive view and understanding of the history of the folk-narrative and fairy-tale web, it also competes for authority with the text being translated. Seen as transparent, a translation tends to give readers a false sense of security in reading at the lexical level. Is close reading of language in the study of folktale and fairy-tale unimportant or independent of the language? Is it even responsible scholarship to undertake a close reading and make interpretive judgments about a tale in translation? Is it

adequate, from the scholar's point of view, to focus on motifs and plots, on the narrative level, without concern for the texture, nuance, and meanings of the original words? The answer to these questions may depend on a given scholar's own orientation and analytical method. A scholar trained as a folklorist may be less concerned about meaning and nuance at the lexical level than a literary scholar prone to close readings.

As translation theory has made clear, we deceive ourselves to believe that translations are transparent, however pragmatic and convenient that may be. As Cristina Bacchilega writes: "Translation facilitates communication, but is not synonymous with it. I may know this, but like many I find it more efficient and reassuring to go through my day as if translation and its problems were invisible" (2007, 13). Once the illusion of transparency is dispelled, translation appears problematic and may be seen as an act of appropriation, a transgression that betrays a tale's cultural value and integrity. This is certainly the case in translations of indigenous tales by colonial powers[11], which comprise many of the collections still used as resources by students and scholars, at least in Anglo-American fairy-tale studies.

Of course, pragmatically speaking, it seems better to have access to tales in translation than none at all. However, because translations will continue to play a role in serious scholarship, these issues require constant foregrounding, critical awareness, and discussion, particularly in the transnational, transcultural, and hyperconnected global arena in which we find ourselves working nowadays. Accordingly, it is critical that we advocate for language and cultural training in master's and doctoral programs in our respective disciplines (again, especially in North America), that we continue to produce informed translations of primary a n d significant secondary texts, and that scholars with diverse linguistic and cultural expertise collaborate on comparative and cross-cultural projects (Haase 2010, 29). However, these pragmatic steps are not enough. Coming to grips with the question of translation in twenty-first century folktale and fairy-tale studies, as I have argued before, requires recognizing that translations "are already literary adaptations, transcultural creations that must be experienced in their own right. The challenge, it seems to me, is to go about this work of inevitable appropriation – whether as producers or consumers of translations – self-consciously and self-critically – to understand fairy-tale production and reception precisely as acts of translation, transformation, and transcultural communication" (Haase 2010,

---

11 See Sadhana Naithani's nuanced treatment of colonial translations and editions (2006, 2010) and Bacchilega's theoretically informed discussions of translation and the misrepresentation of Hawaiian narratives (2007).

30)[12]. Vanessa Joosen (2011) has shown how postmodern fairy-tale production and fairy-tale scholarship have been engaged in a fertile dialogue over the course of the last forty years, and it is no exaggeration to say that during that time the dividing line between creative work and scholarship has become permeable. Scholarship has an intertextual role in the fairy-tale web, and creative fairy-tale texts and editions by trade publishers have incorporated the ideas and assumed some characteristic of fairy-tale scholarship (see Haase 2006, 224–228). The hybrid blending of fictional narrative with scholarship is evident in a work like Lee Haring's *Stars and Keys: Folktales and Creolization in the Indian Ocean* (2007), where translations of oral tales are interspersed with Haring's commentary. As he describes it: "Into [some tales] I interpolate commentary, as if I were reading to you and then looking up to explain something from time to time" (xii). To be sure, Haring is not the first scholar to employ this format. However, what Haring says in a note acknowledging his model is telling: "Historian Paul Ottino is one scholarly model for this alternation of text and comment (Ottino, P., *L'Étrangère*), but every parent reads to a child" (365, note 1). By invoking both a scholarly work and a storytelling scene, as well as a scholar and a storyteller, Haring characterizes the dual nature of his own edition of translated stories and his own hybrid role as storyteller-scholar. And in that there is an implicit lesson for us (in the role of reader-listener-child) about the creative, narrative nature of folktale and fairy-tale scholarship – a lesson that at the same time humbles and empowers.

Collaboration

The view of twenty-first-century folktale and fairy-tale studies that I have sketched here implies that conventional approaches will no longer do justice to a great part of the contemporary production and reception of folktales and fairy-tales. Concepts such as 'simple forms,' 'one dimensionality,' 'oral-literary,' or 'tale type' have their limits and are inadequate to manage and make sense of an ever-expanding universe of texts, whose center has been displaced by a fairy-tale web, to which multivocal and multivalent texts are hypertextually linked within the context of transcultural and global acts of creative production and reception. Given this complexity and diversity, and the linguistic and transcultural expertise required to comprehend the text in its manifold contexts and relationships, we might well wonder whether an individual scholar is up to the task.

---

12 On translation as creation, see also Bassnett 2006; and Hennard Dutheil de la Rochère 2013, especially 3–7 and 299–301.

When designing the three-volume *Greenwood Encyclopedia of Folktales and Fairy Tales*[13], I was inspired by the monumental and incomparable *EM* to develop a project based on the collaboration of folk-narrative and fairy-tale scholars, to let diverse voices and approaches exist side by side, overlap, intersect, and even contradict each other. That cultivation of diverse voices may be an anti-encyclopedic impulse from a publisher's point of view, but it delivers a more accurate picture of the breadth and manifold relationships of folk-narrative research and fairy-tale studies. And it contributes in its own way to a conversation among folk-narrative and fairy-tale scholars. Without such conversations, teamwork, and collaborative projects, we are all impoverished and, I believe, handicapped in dealing with tales in the twenty-first century. The conversational and collaborative nature of our work should include a concerted effort to become familiar with and to use the scholarship of other disciplines, languages, and cultures. Too often books and articles – and the ideas communicated in them – are not moving across national or disciplinary borders. Admittedly, paywalls and the high cost of printed books and journals inhibit access to scholarship, especially in economically disadvantaged regions and despite helpful repositories on the Internet and the ease of transmitting scholarship via the Internet. In other cases, however, one might suspect it is the lack of the requisite language skills or even lack of interest in "distant" voices. Whatever the reasons for these absences, they do not serve us well. We should challenge ourselves to do better, to open ourselves to the work of colleagues everywhere.

What I wrote almost a decade ago in composing the introduction to my own encyclopedic project still holds true:

> The institutionalization of fairy-tale studies has not resulted in a monolithic discourse, universally recognized canon, or dominant methodology, which actually attests to the vitality of the field. In my opinion, the ultimate challenge for fairy-tale studies is to cultivate a constructive transnational interdisciplinary conversation that can promote approaches that are appropriate both for rethinking the past and for coming to grips with new forms of production and reception during this dynamic era of fairy-tale proliferation and change. (Haase 2008, xxxviii)

Throughout the decades of its origin and publication – decades in which folktale and fairy-tale scholarship steadily expanded and experienced significant new developments – the *Enzyklopädie des Märchens* accommodated change and remained open to new perspectives and new voices by seeking the collaboration of scholars representing diverse cultures, disciplines, and theoretical-methodologi-

---

13 The same applies to the four-volume second revised and expanded edition of the Greenwood Encyclopedia, published with my co-editor Anne E. Duggan under the title: Folktales and Fairy Tales: Traditions and Texts from around the World (Duggan/Haase 2016).

cal approaches. We would do well to keep the *EM* in mind and recognize the essential importance of collaboration as we address the complex challenges of folktale and fairy-tale studies in the twenty-first century.

Bibliography

Bacchilega, Cristina: Legendary Hawai'i and the Politics of Place: Tradition, Translation, and Tourism. Philadelphia 2007.

ead.: Fairy Tales Transformed? Twenty-First Century Adaptations and the Politics of Wonder. Detroit 2013.

Barchilon, Jacques: Le conte merveilleux français de 1690 à 1790: Cent ans de féerie et de poésie ignorées de l'histoire littéraire. Paris 1975.

Bassnett, Susan: Writing and Translating. In: Bassnett, Susan/Bush, Peter R. (eds.): The Translator as Writer. London 2006, 173–183.

Bausinger, Hermann: Volksideologie und Volksforschung: Zur nationalsozialistischen Volksforschung. In: Zeitschrift für Volkskunde 61 (1965) 177–204.

Bausinger, Hermann, et al.: Grundzüge der Volkskunde. Darmstadt 1978.

Bluhm, Lothar: Grimm-Philologie: Beiträge zur Märchenforschung und Wissenschaftsgeschichte. Hildesheim 1995.

Canepa, Nancy (ed.): Out of the Woods: The Origins of the Literary Fairy Tale in Italy and France. Detroit 1997.

Dorson, Richard M. (ed.): Folklore and Folklife: An Introduction. Chicago/London 1972.

Dow, James R.: There Is No Grand Theory in German, and for Good Reason. In: Journal of American Folklore 45 (2008) 55–62.

Duggan, Anne E./Haase, Donald (eds.): Folktales and Fairy Tales: Traditions and Texts from around the World 1–4. Santa Barbara [2]2016.

Fairy Tale Origins Thousands of Years Old, Researchers Say. BBC. 20 January 2016. http://www.bbc.com/news/uk-35358487. (Accessed 23 January 2016).

Gottschall, Jonathan: The 'Beauty Myth' Is No Myth: Emphasis on Male-Female Attractiveness in World Folktales. In: Human Nature 19 (2008) 174–188.

Graça da Silva, Sara/Tehrani, Jamshid J.: Comparative Phylogenetic Analyses Uncover the Ancient Roots of Indo-European Folktales. In: Royal Society Open Science 3 (20 January 2016). http://dx.doi.org/10.1098/rsos.150645. (Accessed 22 January 2016).

Haase, Donald: American Germanists and Research on Folklore and Fairy Tales from 1970 to the Present. In: Hohendahl, Peter Uwe (ed.): German Studies in the United States: A Historical Handbook. New York 2003, 294–298.

id.: Hypertextual Gutenberg: The Textual and Hypertextual Life of Folktales and Fairy Tales in English-Language Popular Print Editions. In: Fabula 47 (2006) 222–230.

id. (ed.): The Greenwood Encyclopedia of Folktales and Fairy Tales 1–3. Westport, CT/London 2008.

id.: Decolonizing Fairy-Tale Studies. In: Marvels & Tales 24 (2010) 17–38.

Haring, Lee: Stars and Keys: Folktales and Creolization in the Indian Ocean. With translations by Claudie Ricaud and Dawood Auleear. Bloomington 2007.

Harries, Elizabeth Wanning: Twice upon a Time: Women Writers and the History of the Fairy Tale. Princeton, NJ, 2001.

Hennard Dutheil de la Rochère, Martine: Reading, Translating, Rewriting: Angela Carter's Translational Poetics. Detroit 2013.

Joosen, Vanessa: Critical and Creative Perspectives on Fairy Tales: An Intertextual Dialogue between Fairy-Tale Scholarship and Postmodern Retellings. Detroit 2011.

Jorgensen, Jeana: Gender and the Body in Classical European Fairy Tales. PhD Diss. Indiana University 2012.

ead.: Quantifying the Grimm Corpus: Transgressive and Transformative Bodies in the Grimms' Fairy Tales. In: Marvels & Tales 28 (2014) 127–141.

Jorgensen, Jeana/Weingart, Scott: Computational Analysis of Gender and the Body in European Fairy Tales. In: Literary and Linguistic Computing 28 (2013) 404–416.

Kamenetsky, Christa: Folklore as a Political Tool in Nazi Germany. In: Journal of American Folklore 85 (1972) 231–235.

ead.: Folktale and Ideology in the Third Reich. In: Journal of American Folklore 90 (1977) 168–178.

Lüthi, Max: Märchen. (Sammlung Metzler 16). Rölleke, Heinz (ed.). Stuttgart (1962) [9]1996.

Meder, Theo: From a Dutch Folktale Database towards an International Folktale Database. In: Fabula 51 (2010) 6–22.

Naithani, Sadhana: In Quest of Indian Folktales: Pandit Ram Gharib Chaube and William Crooke. Bloomington 2006.

ead.: The Story-Time of the British Empire: Colonial and Postcolonial Folkloristics. Jackson, MS, 2010.

Paredes, Américo/Bauman, Richard (eds.): Toward New Perspectives in Folklore. Austin 1972.

Ranke, Kurt, et al.: Vorwort. In: iid. (eds.): Enzyklopädie des Märchens 1. ed. Rolf Wilhelm Brednich et al. Berlin/New York 1977, v–vii.

Rudy, Jill Terry et al.: At the Crossroads of Data and Wonder: Algorithmic Visualizations of Fairy-Tales on Television. N.d. http://fttv.byu.edu/#home. (Accessed 21 January 2016).

Schmit-Lauber, Brigitta: Seeing, Hearing, Feeling, Writing: Approaches and Methods from the Perspective of Ethnological Analysis of the Present. In: A Companion to Folklore. eds. Regina F. Bendix/Galit Hasan-Rokem. Chichester (2012) 2014, 559–578.

Seifert, Lewis C.: Fairy Tales, Sexuality, and Gender in France, 1690–1715: Nostalgic Utopias. Cambridge 1996.

Tangerlini, Timothy R.: The Folklore Macroscope: Challenges for a Computational Folkloristics. In: Western Folklore 72 (2013) 7–27.

id. (ed.): Journal of American Folklore [special issue on computational folkloristics] 129 (2016).

Tehrani, Jamshid/Nguyen, Quan/Roos, Teemu: Oral Fairy Tale or Literary Fake? Investigating the Origins of Little Red Riding Hood Using Phylogenetic Network Analysis. In: Digital Scholarship in the Humanities (23 June 2015). http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/llc/fqv016. (Accessed 22 January 2016).

Zipes, Jack: The Fight over Fairy-Tale Discourse: Family, Friction, and Socialization in the Weimar Republic and Nazi Germany. In: id.: Fairy Tales and the Art of Subversion: The Classical Genre for Children and the Process of Civilization. New York 1983, 134–169.

id.: Fulfilling the Grimm's Legacy: The International Mission of the Enzyklopädie des Märchens. In: Fabula 57 (2016), 60–72.